

## REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the Office action dated October 5, 2007. No claims are amended and no claims are canceled. Accordingly, after entry of this Response, claims 1-19 remain pending.

### I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 10-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,894,981 to Coile et al. (hereinafter "Coile"). A proper anticipation rejection requires that each and every limitation of a claim be disclosed in a single prior art reference.

Initially, the rejections of independent claims 1, 11, 12, 13 and 16 are addressed. Independent claim 1 includes a limitation "at least one back-end server connected to the front-end server through a data link, without establishing a transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) connection, for executing the service command in the data link frame received from the front-end server through the data link and for sending a result of the service command to the client bypassing the front-end server in a pseudo packet that would be recognized by the client as a packet originating from the front-end server." Independent claims 11, 12, 13 and 16 include a similar limitation. The Examiner asserts that Coile teaches this limitation. *See Office action, page 3, citing column 8, lines 43-51 and column 9, lines 18-36.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Coile discloses the use of a proxy server that transparently intercepts TCP/IP packets, examines the connection addresses, and if the connection is allowed to the server, forwards the packets to the server via a TCP/IP connection. *See Coile, Figures 3 and 4 and column 8, lines 18-36.* As such, Coile does not disclose a "back-end server connected to the front-end server through a data link, without establishing a TCP/IP connection," as required by at least independent claim 1. Further, the client in Coile sends TCP/IP packets addressed to the back-end server rather than sending TCP/IP packets addressed to the front-end server. *See Coile, column 9, lines 14-17.* As such, the front-end server in Coile does not generate a data link frame containing a service command necessary to perform the service request as required by the independent claims.

Insofar as Coile does not disclose all of the limitations of any of independent claims 1, 11, 12, 13 and 16, Coile is insufficient to anticipate the independent claims and Applicant respectfully requests such indication. The remaining rejected claims 2-4, 10, 14-15 and 17-19 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 13 and 16. Accordingly, these dependent claims are patentable over Coile for at least the reasons set

forth above and such indication is respectfully requested. This statement is made without reference to or waiving the independent bases of patentability within each dependent claim.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coile. Claims 5-9 depend from independent claim 1 which has been shown to be patentable over Coile for the reasons set forth in section I. Accordingly, claims 5-9 are patentable over Coile and the Applicant respectfully requests such indication. This statement is made without reference to or waiving the independent bases of patentability within each dependent claim.

III. Conclusion


The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. The Applicant respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

This Amendment is submitted contemporaneously with a petition for a three-month extension of time in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Accordingly, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 in the amount of \$525.00, for a three-month extension of time fee. The Applicant believes no further fees or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 accordingly.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: 1 Apr 2008

Respectfully submitted,

  
S. Craig Hermsen, Registration No. 44,759  
Attorney for Applicant  
USPTO Customer No. 20686

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700  
370 Seventeenth Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647  
Phone: (303) 629-3400  
Fax: (303) 629-3450